

*United Nations*  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**



**THIRTY-EIGHTH SESSION**

*Official Records\**

GENERAL COMMITTEE  
1st meeting  
held on  
Wednesday, 21 September 1983  
at 10.30 a.m.  
New York

**SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 1st MEETING**

Chairman: Mr. ILLUECA (President of the General Assembly)

**CONTENTS**

**ORGANIZATION OF THE THIRTY-EIGHTH REGULAR SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND ALLOCATION OF ITEMS: MEMORANDUM BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL**

---

\*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL  
A/BUR/38/SR.1  
27 September 1983

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 11 a.m.

ORGANIZATION OF THE THIRTY-EIGHTH REGULAR SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, 'ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND ALLOCATION OF ITEMS: MEMORANDUM BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/BUR/38/1)

Section II. Organization of the session

1. The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of the General Committee to section II of document A/BUR/38/1 relating to the organization of the session. By its decision 34/401, which had been reproduced as annex VI to its rules of procedure, the General Assembly had adopted a number of provisions aimed at rationalizing its procedures and organization. Many of those provisions had already been implemented at the thirty-fourth to thirty-seventh sessions and were therefore not referred to in the present document. However, he believed that the General Committee might wish to draw the attention of the General Assembly to those provisions which had not yet been or had been only partly implemented.

Paragraph 4 (General Committee)

2. The Committee took note of paragraph 4 of the Secretary-General's memorandum.

Paragraph 5 (Schedule of meetings)

3. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to paragraph 5 of the Secretary-General's memorandum, which concerned the schedule of meetings and promptness in starting meetings. In that connection, he suggested that the Committee might also wish to draw the attention of the General Assembly to rules 67 and 108 of the rules of procedure, whereby the President of the General Assembly might declare a meeting open and permit the debate to proceed when at least one third of the members were present, and the Chairman of a Main Committee might declare a meeting open and permit the debate to proceed when at least one quarter of the members were present. In that regard, he endorsed the practical suggestion made at the preceding three sessions that each delegation should designate someone to be present at the scheduled time, thereby avoiding the problem of a quorum. Some progress had been reported, but there was still considerable room for improvement.

4. The Committee decided to draw the attention of the General Assembly to paragraph 3 of decision 34/401.

Paragraphs 6 and 7 (General debate)

5. The CHAIRMAN urged representatives to take the floor in the order in which they appeared on the list of speakers, in view of the unprecedented number of speakers already inscribed, including many heads of State and heads of Government.

6. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should adopt the suggestions contained in paragraphs 6 and 7 of the Secretary-General's memorandum.

7. The CHAIRMAN said that, with regard to the general debate, he had been informed by the Secretariat that it was physically impossible for all speakers already inscribed to be accommodated within the period of three weeks usually assigned for that purpose, and especially during the first week of that period. On the basis of the consultations already held on the question, he therefore suggested that, during the period of the general debate, morning plenary meetings should begin at 10 a.m. instead of 10.30 a.m. He added that it would also be necessary for the Assembly to meet on Saturday, 1 October.

8. Mr. KOH (Singapore) supported the suggestion that the General Assembly should hold a meeting on Saturday, 1 October 1983 to accommodate the lengthy list of speakers. However, in view of the fact that several hundred hours were wasted during each session because of delegations' tardiness, he proposed that, during the period of the general debate, morning meetings should begin a full hour earlier than usual, at 9.30 a.m.

9. The CHAIRMAN replied that, during the early weeks of the General Assembly's regular sessions, many heads of State and heads of Government held interviews with the Secretary-General and the President of the General Assembly prior to addressing the Assembly itself; thus, it was not possible for morning meetings to begin at 9.30 a.m.

10. The Committee decided to recommend that, during the period of the general debate, morning plenary meetings should begin at 10 a.m. instead of 10.30 a.m.

Paragraph 8 (Explanations of vote)

11. The Committee decided to draw the attention of the General Assembly to paragraph 7 of decision 34/401.

Paragraph 9 (Closing date of the session)

12. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should adopt the suggestion contained in paragraph 9 of the Secretary-General's memorandum.

Paragraph 10 (Records of the Main Committees)

13. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should adopt the suggestions contained in paragraph 10 of the Secretary-General's memorandum.

Paragraph 12 (Election of the Chairmen of the Main Committees)

14. The Committee decided to draw the attention of the General Assembly to the provisions of paragraphs 18 and 19 of decision 34/401 contained in paragraph 12 of the Secretary-General's memorandum and to the need to implement them.

Paragraph 13 (Concluding statements)

15. The Committee decided to draw the attention of the General Assembly to the need for the full implementation of paragraph 17 of decision 34/401.

Paragraphs 14 and 15 (Questions related to the programme budget)

16. Mr. KUYAMA (Japan) noted, in connection with paragraph 14, that for the first time the programme budget implications of proposals, as distinct from financial implications, were to be considered whenever proposals were taken up. He proposed that, since there was no clear-cut procedure in existence, the programme implications of proposals should first be considered by the Main Committee concerned before going to the Fifth Committee for consideration.

17. With regard to the mandatory deadline for the submission to the Fifth Committee of draft resolutions with financial implications, referred to in paragraph 15, he noted that that provision had rarely been observed in the past, and requested the Chairmen of the Main Committees to co-operate in that matter.

18. The Committee decided to draw the attention of the General Assembly to the provisions of paragraphs 14 and 15 of the Secretary-General's memorandum.

Paragraphs 16 and 17 (Documentation)

19. The Committee decided to draw the attention of the General Assembly to paragraph 28 of decision 34/401 and to recommend that the General Assembly should urge all Member States and subsidiary organs to follow the suggestion contained in paragraph 17 of the Secretary-General's memorandum.

Paragraph 18 (Resolutions)

20. The Committee decided to draw the attention of the General Assembly to paragraph 32 of decision 34/401.

Paragraph 19 (Special conferences)

21. The Committee decided to draw the attention of the General Assembly to paragraph 19 of the Secretary-General's memorandum.

Paragraph 20 (Meetings of subsidiary organs)

22. The CHAIRMAN said that the Chairman of the Committee on Conferences had recommended in documents A/38/414 and Add.1 that eleven subsidiary organs should be allowed to meet during the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly.

23. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should authorize the eleven subsidiary organs of the Assembly listed in documents A/38/414 and Add.1 to meet during the thirty-eighth session.

Paragraph 21 (Question of smoking in conference rooms)

24. The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of the Committee to paragraph 21 of the Secretary-General's memorandum regarding the question of smoking in conference rooms. Preliminary consultations on the subject among regional groups had yielded no consensus on the matter. However, the following measures had been suggested:

(The Chairman)

a ban on smoking in small conference rooms (such as rooms 5 to 10 and A to E) together with a possible restriction of smoking to the sides and rear of large conference rooms (such as rooms 1 to 4); and an appeal to refrain from smoking in conference rooms as an experimental measure for a period of one year.

25. Mr. KOH (Singapore) observed that medical science had demonstrated beyond a reasonable doubt that smoking was harmful not only to smokers but also to non-smokers, who were forced to inhale the smoke produced by their colleagues. It was time that the United Nations should emulate the good example set by WHO and FAO. He consequently supported the suggestions to which the Chairman had alluded.

26. Mr. RODRIGUE-MEDINA (Colombia) said that many members of delegations smoked in order to relieve tension, which might otherwise be vented in discussions. Furthermore, if areas of meeting rooms were set aside for smokers, it would be difficult to maintain discipline in the committees.

27. Mr. KOROMA (Sierra Leone) said that in small meeting rooms tension sometimes built up when smokers protested against a ruling of the Chairman barring smoking. Perhaps notices could be put up in small committee rooms, appealing to members not to smoke; that approach would avoid infringing the rights of smokers.

28. Sir John THOMSON (United Kingdom) said that he supported the measures outlined by the Chairman; they were more moderate than the suggestion made by the Director-General of the World Health Organization and therefore represented a compromise formula.

29. Mr. RODRIGUEZ-MEDINA (Colombia) said that it would be undesirable to compel those wishing to smoke to leave meeting rooms in order to do so.

30. Mr. CHAVANAVIRAJ (Thailand) said that he supported the proposal made by the representative of Sierra Leone.

31. Mr. KOH (Singapore) said he appreciated that smokers had a right to smoke, but they were not entitled to exercise that right to the point of infringing the rights of others; thus if smokers wished to smoke they should go elsewhere. However, he could support the proposal made by the representative of Sierra Leone.

32. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had completed its consideration of section II of the memorandum by the Secretary-General, with the exception of the paragraph on smoking, the consideration of which would be resumed at a subsequent meeting.

### Section III. Adoption of the agenda

33. The CHAIRMAN said that, in accordance with rule 40 of the rules of procedure, the Committee was not considering the substance of any item except in so far as it bore on the question of whether or not to recommend the inclusion of that item in the agenda. The draft agenda consisted of 142 items, 138 of which appeared in the provisional agenda (A/38/150) and four in the supplementary list (A/38/200).

Paragraph 23

34. The CHAIRMAN said that the representative of the Philippines had asked to participate in the discussion of paragraph 23; if there was no objection, he would invite him to take a place at the Committee table.

35. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Arcilla (Philippines) took a place at the Committee table.

36. Mr. ARCILLA (Philippines) said that the question entitled "New international human order: moral aspects of development" had been included in the agenda of the thirty-seventh session as sub-item (p) of item 71 on the recommendation of the General Committee and had subsequently been allocated to the Second Committee. Resolution 37/225, which had been adopted by consensus in the Second Committee, had invited Governments to submit comments on the question and requested the Economic and Social Council to consider the matter at its second regular session of 1983. The question had received much sympathetic attention in the Council, which had adopted a resolution, sponsored by nine Member States; that resolution was now before the General Assembly. Since some delegations had said that, owing to lack of time, the question had not been considered in depth, his delegation was proposing that it should be placed on the agenda of the General Assembly.

37. The General Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should inscribe the question entitled "New international human order: moral aspects of development" as sub-item (n) of item 78 of the draft agenda.

38. Mr. Arcilla (Philippines) withdrew.

Paragraph 24

39. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should clarify conclusively its intention to abolish the Peace Observation Commission and, consequently, delete sub-item (f) of item 17 of the draft agenda.

Paragraph 25

40. The Committee took note of paragraph 25 of the Secretary-General's memorandum.

Inclusion of items

Items 1 to 6

41. The CHAIRMAN said that items 1 to 6 had already been considered; he would therefore take it that there were no comments on their inclusion in the agenda.

Items 7 to 16

42. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include items 7 to 16 in the agenda.

Item 17

43. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include item 17 in the agenda.

Items 18 to 22

44. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include items 18 to 22 in the agenda.

Item 23

45. Mr. PETROVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the inclusion in the agenda of an item entitled "The situation in Kampuchea" conflicted with the clearly expressed will of the legitimate government of that country and therefore constituted direct interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign State. Agitation about the so-called "Kampuchean question" in the United Nations reflected the desire of certain States to impose on the Kampuchean people the criminal Pol Pot régime. Consideration of the so-called "Kampuchean question" at previous sessions had led to the adoption of resolutions which were devoid of political realism, had placed obstacles in the path of the normalization of the situation in the region, and served only the interests of those countries which were trying to exacerbate the situation in South-East Asia. It was the duty of the United Nations to contribute to the development of good-neighbourly relations between the States of South-East Asia, the normalization of the situation in the region and the conversion of the region into a zone of peace, co-operation and stability.

46. Mr. CHAVANAVIRAJ (Thailand) said that the Kampuchean problem remained the central obstacle to the restoration of peace and stability in South-East Asia, and had also given rise to serious security problems and a refugee problem on a scale never witnessed before. Over the past four years, Kampuchea and the Asian countries had made all possible efforts to find a peaceful political solution to the problem through the United Nations. The main objective was to bring all the parties concerned to the negotiating table to seek a comprehensive political solution based on the withdrawal of all foreign forces and the exercise by the Kampuchean people of their right to self-determination. Unfortunately, no substantive progress had been made in implementing the General Assembly resolutions on the subject and the region was no closer to any agreement on the total withdrawal of all foreign forces and the right of the Kampuchean people to determine their own future. His delegation therefore supported the inclusion of the item in the agenda.

47. Mr. LIANG Yufan (China) said that for four years in succession the General Assembly had adopted resolutions on the situation in Kampuchea calling for the unconditional withdrawal of all foreign troops from Kampuchea so that the Kampuchean people could hold free elections without outside interference. So far, however, the resolutions had not been implemented, and foreign aggressive troops had intensified their military aggression against the patriotic forces and people of Kampuchea; furthermore, they had attacked unarmed refugee camps and violated

(Mr. Liang Yufan, China)

Thailand's territorial integrity and sovereignty, thus aggravating tension in the area. In order to maintain peace and security in South East Asia, and oppose aggression and interference, it was imperative for the General Assembly to continue its consideration of the item entitled "The situation in Kampuchea". In that connection, it was absolutely unreasonable that the representative of the Soviet Union was putting forward the pretext of non-interference in internal affairs. As everyone was aware, there had been no such item on the agenda of the General Assembly before 1978; it had been the military occupation of Kampuchea by the Vietnamese authorities with the help of the Soviet Union which had prompted the General Assembly to consider the item, which should remain on the agenda until the independence and sovereignty of Kampuchea were assured.

48. Mr. STRUCKA (Czechoslovakia) said that once again the item on the situation in Kampuchea was being imposed on the General Assembly. The purpose was to mislead world public opinion, falsify the course of events in the People's Republic of Kampuchea and give encouragement to the remnants of the Pol Pot bands and other Khmer reactionaries engaged in subversive activities against the people of Kampuchea. The inclusion of the item in the agenda would be in flagrant contradiction with the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of States, which was one of the basic precepts of the existence and effective work of the United Nations. The consideration of the item would amount to an encroachment on the independence and sovereignty of the People's Republic of Kampuchea. The attempts to have the item considered at the current session were being made despite the clearly expressed will of the people of Kampuchea and their legitimate government. The Kampuchean people had risen against the bloody terror unleashed in their country by the Pol Pot régime which was responsible for the death of over 2,750,000 people. They had dealt once and for all with those responsible for the Pol Pot atrocities and were successfully withstanding the aggressive onslaughts carried out on the instructions of the forces of imperialism and hegemonism. The Kampuchean people exercised full power in Kampuchea and that process was irreversible. In short, the situation in Kampuchea was exclusively an internal matter for the people of Kampuchea and its discussion had no place in the United Nations.

49. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include item 23 in the agenda.

Items 24 to 28

50. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include items 24 to 28 in the agenda.

Item 29

51. The CHAIRMAN said that the representative of Afghanistan had asked to participate in the discussion of the item; if there was no objection, he would invite him to take a place at the Committee table.



52. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Zarif (Afghanistan) took a place at the Committee table.

53. Mr. ZARIF (Afghanistan) said that, at the thirty-fifth, thirty-sixth and thirty-seventh sessions, his delegation had strongly objected to the inclusion in the agenda of the item on the situation in Afghanistan. It had stated at length why it was not prepared to discuss its country's internal affairs in any international forum. As was evident from the title of item 29, it was the situation within Afghanistan that would be under discussion. That would be contrary to Article 2, paragraph 7, of the United Nations Charter, which stated that nothing in the Charter authorized the United Nations to intervene in matters which were essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State or required the Members to submit such matters to settlement under the Charter. The experience of the past three sessions clearly showed that the sponsors of the item were determined to interfere in the internal affairs of Afghanistan.

54. The whole issue had been artificially created by the forces of imperialism and hegemonism in an attempt to divert attention from the real problems for which they themselves were responsible, such as the danger of a nuclear holocaust, the military build-up by the imperialists, the situation in Israeli-occupied Lebanon, the plight of the Palestinians, the situation in southern Africa, imperialistic intervention in Central America and the Caribbean, the denial of the right of peoples to self-determination and independence, and the unjust international relations that had led to economic hardship in the developing countries. Contrary to their stated intentions, the sponsors of the item were not interested in solving the real problems; instead, they missed no opportunity to put obstacles in the way of solutions.

55. On 14 May 1980 and on 24 August 1981, his Government had put forward two proposals, which constituted the most realistic basis for a comprehensive solution to the problems faced by Afghanistan and its neighbours. Within the past year, there had been positive developments as a result of the personal efforts of the Secretary-General and his special representative. Discussions between Pakistan and Afghanistan had continued in April and June 1983. His Government was satisfied with the results of the Geneva talks and looked forward to future negotiations. It believed that a hasty debate in the General Assembly, far from facilitating solutions, would only further complicate the situation. With a sincere political will on all sides, it would be possible to create the right political climate for direct bilateral negotiations. Only through such negotiations would it be possible to consider the various aspects of the difficulties and pave the way for the normalization of relations and the promotion of peace and stability in the region.

56. Under no circumstances would Afghanistan submit to pressure from any quarter. The outcome of any discussion on item 29 would not be acceptable to or binding on his Government. The people of Afghanistan consistently rallied round their Government in resisting external pressure. They did not expect the General Assembly to be used as an instrument of interference and pressure. The Assembly's best course of action would be to avoid a propagandistic discussion. Afghanistan remained convinced that, if a spirit of flexibility continued to prevail, it would be possible to work out an honourable solution in the interests of Pakistan, Afghanistan and the region.

57. Mr. MAHMOOD (Pakistan) said that his delegation strongly supported the inclusion of item 29, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 37/37. There was no procedural or substantive reason to exclude the item. Several Assembly resolutions denouncing the foreign intervention in Afghanistan and the grave violation of the United Nations Charter remained unimplemented. The continuing intervention by foreign forces posed a serious threat to international peace and security.
58. The situation had been further complicated by the vast humanitarian problem caused by millions of Afghan refugees. It was imperative for the General Assembly to continue focusing on the situation in Afghanistan until such time as the Charter provisions and the Assembly resolutions were complied with, foreign troops were withdrawn from Afghanistan, there was respect for its sovereignty and independence, and the refugees returned to their country. The objections to the inclusion of the item in the agenda were not new and had already been rejected by the General Assembly.
59. In a sincere spirit of co-operation, Pakistan was participating in negotiations with Afghanistan, which it hoped would soon lead to a just solution. The issue, however, was of direct concern to the international community as a whole. An expression of concern by the General Assembly was vital if the momentum for a just and expeditious solution was to be maintained.
60. Mr. PETROVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said the Soviet Union unreservedly supported Afghanistan's contention that item 29 should not be included in the agenda. Consideration of the item by the Assembly would constitute interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan and would thus be contrary to the Charter. All the commotion regarding the item only served the interests of those who were seeking pretexts for fostering confrontation, increasing tension, waging an undeclared war against Afghanistan and impeding the normalization of the situation in the region. No realistic person could fail to see that the discussion in the Assembly would be used as a smoke-screen by those who were obstructing the search for a political solution to the question.
61. His delegation hoped that other delegations would act responsibly and not impede the normalization of the situation around Afghanistan.
62. Mr. LIANG Yufan (China) said that Afghanistan had once been a peaceful, neutral and non-aligned country. As a result of foreign intervention, however, its independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity had been seriously undermined. In addition, international peace and security had been put into jeopardy. The resolutions calling for the withdrawal of foreign troops, which the General Assembly had adopted by an overwhelming majority, had not been implemented. The foreign troops were still occupying the country. The Assembly should continue to consider the situation in Afghanistan in the ongoing effort to uphold the purposes and principles of the Charter, maintain international peace and security, and combat intervention and aggression.

63. Mr. STRUCKA (Czechoslovakia) said that the so-called question of Afghanistan had been artificially created, against the wishes of the people of Afghanistan, when they had tried to restructure the system of government. The forces of imperialism and hegemonism had of course reacted unfavourably when Afghanistan had been compelled to turn to the Soviet Union for help on the basis of an agreement with that country and in accordance with Article 51 of the United Nations Charter. The General Assembly's discussion of the situation in Afghanistan had not prevented certain elements from sending thousands of terrorists to kill people and destroy facilities such as hospitals in Afghanistan. Such activities and the attempts to violate the principle of non-interference in internal affairs and other principles were clearly against the express wishes of the people and Government of Afghanistan. Certain elements were seeking a smoke-screen for the illegal activities of imperialism, which were not conducive to the achievement of the fundamental objectives of the United Nations. His delegation strongly opposed the inclusion of item 29 in the agenda.

64. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include item 29 in the agenda.

65. Mr Zarif (Afghanistan) withdrew.

#### Item 30

66. Mr. de la BARRE de NANTEUIL (France) said that, since item 30 dealt with the question of Mayotte, a territory under French sovereignty, consideration of the item by the General Assembly would be in violation of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter, which stated that nothing contained in the Charter authorized the United Nations to intervene in matters which were essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State. The relevant issues were regularly discussed in the course of periodic consultations between the Comoros and France. His Government had appointed an official to maintain that dialogue with the Comorian authorities.

67. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include item 30 in the agenda.

#### Items 31 to 38

68. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include items 31 to 38 in the agenda.

#### Item 39

69. Mr. de la BARRE de NANTEUIL (France) said that, at previous sessions, his delegation had stated why the question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council should not be included in the agenda. A change in the membership of the Council would clearly affect its functioning and upset the balance between the main United Nations organs. The Council was the only organ empowered by the Charter to take decisions that were binding on all Members of the United Nations in respect of the maintenance of international peace and

(Mr. de la Barre de Nanteuil, France)

security. It would be wrong to divide the members of the Council into regional groups as was the case in the General Assembly, because of the different functions and philosophies of the two organs.

70. Consideration of item 39 by the Assembly would only lead to confrontation and a weakening of the United Nations at a time when every effort should be made to revitalize it. France therefore remained opposed to the inclusion of the item and to any attempt to change the membership of the Security Council.

71. Mr. TREIKI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that, in the years since the establishment of the Organization, its nature had changed; there had been a number of human, economic, political and other developments and its membership had tripled.

72. The paralysis of the United Nations was due to the composition of the Council and to the privileges which some of its members had arrogated to themselves. The veto was constantly being misused, against the wishes of the majority. In any event, the criteria according to which certain States had assumed the right of veto were no longer met by some permanent members, which had ceased to enjoy their self-endowed former military and economic might. It was unjustifiable that the permanent members should have such a wide-ranging power of decision. The membership of the Council should be increased since it was currently not commensurate with that of the United Nations. A handful of States should not be allowed to abuse their privileges in order to control the destiny of the United Nations and mankind without regard for the aspiration of peoples for liberation and independence. His delegation fully supported the inclusion of item 39 in the agenda.

73. Mr. BARRINGTON (United Kingdom) said that his delegation maintained its objections to the inclusion of the item in the agenda. An increase in the membership of the Security Council, far from enhancing its effectiveness, would only introduce an added extra source of controversy. In any event, the diminishing interest in the discussion of the item reflected the realities of the situation. No useful purpose would be served by the inclusion of the item.

74. Mr. MOUSSAOUI (Algeria) noted that the item had been on the agenda since it had been initially proposed by the non-aligned countries at the thirty-fourth session. For reasons stated at previous sessions, Algeria favoured its inclusion.

75. Mr. PETROVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation maintained its objections to the inclusion of the item in the agenda. It deployed the attempt to change one of the fundamental provisions of the Charter.

76. Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America) said that the appropriate forum for the discussion of the issues relating to the membership of the Security Council would be the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization. Item 39 was unnecessary and should not be included in the agenda.

77. Mr. T. S. DORJI (Bhutan) said that the item should be included in the agenda of each session until a decision was reached regarding the membership of the Security Council.

78. The Committee decided to recommend that the General Assembly should include item 39 in the agenda.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.